

### **REMARKS**

In the present Office Action Claims 1-10 were examined. Claims 1-10 were rejected, Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 10 were objected to, and no claims were allowed. By this Amendment and Reply, Claims 1, 2, 4, 7 and 10 were amended, and no claims were added or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1-10 remain pending for further examination.

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the above-identified amendments and following discussion is respectfully requested.

#### **Drawing Requirement under MPEP §608.02(g):**

In Section 1 of the Office Action the Examiner states drawings figures 1-3 should be designated as "Prior Art". Appended to this Amendment and Reply are thirteen (13) sheets of drawings including proposed drawing amendments to FIGS. 1-3. FIGS. 1-3 are proposed to be amended by adding labels indicating that these figures depict prior art systems. Acceptance of these drawing figures and entry of the proposed drawing amendments is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement under MPEP §608.02(g).

#### **Claim Objections:**

In Section 2 of the Office Action the Examiner objects to Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 10 citing informalities in terms used within these claims. Clarifying amendments have been made to Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 10 with the Examiner's comment in mind. Support for these amendments may be found in the original disclosure and thus, no new matter is entered.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 10 as now written.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

In Sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejects Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watson (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,750) in view of Pescitelli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,256). These rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and traversed below.

Watson is seen to disclose an account processing method and system for providing specific pre-authorization parameters for categories of transactions, e.g., individual

transactions or transaction types. Watson describes pre-authorization parameters as including transaction limits, account balance limit, limitations on categories of goods or services as denoted by standard industrial codes (SIC) and other parameters that may be incorporated into a specific account scheme. See, for example, Watson at Col. 7, lines 34-52. As noted by the Examiner, systems such as that described in Watson either accept or deny a requested transaction based on predetermined parameters. As such, the Watson system is similar to prior art devices described in the Background Section of the present application. As described therein, such devices merely limit specific goods or services and/or transaction amounts by accepting or denying a one-time request to complete a transaction. Such systems do not describe or suggest a system which provides a “before transaction” approval of a virtual transaction amount (VTA), followed by an “after transaction” authorization and settlement of the VTA to an actual transaction amount (ATA), as taught and claimed in the present invention.

The Examiner also notes that Watson lacks teaching of the transactions taking place at a self-service facility and the issuing of a receipt for the transaction. The Examiner turns to Pescitelli et al. to cure this defect. Pescitelli et al. are seen to describe a system for vending insurance policies that includes standalone, interactive self-service terminals coupled to a central office. While it is not seen how the Examiner proposes combination of the diverse systems described in Watson and Pescitelli et al., the self-service terminals of Pescitelli et al. are seen to describe providing copies of insurance applications or insurance policy contracts to customers through a dispensing opening (e.g., Pescitelli et al. at Col. 4, lines 54-67). However, even if one attributes such functionality to systems described in Watson, the proposed combination of references are still not seen to describe or suggest all of the limitations of the independent claims of the present application wherein a point-of-sale system provides a “before transaction” approval of a virtual transaction amount (VTA), followed by an “after transaction” authorization and settlement of the VTA to an actual transaction amount (ATA).

For example, the proposed combination of Watson and Pescitelli et al. are not seen to expressly or implicitly describe or suggest the present invention as recited in all of the elements of independent Claim 1, as now written, which recites, in pertinent part:

“1. A method for performing an electronic card enabled transaction in a point of sale (POS) system ..., the method comprising the acts of:  
(a) requesting an approval-before-the-transaction (ABCT) of the authorization center for setting a virtual transaction amount (VTA) at the self service facility;  
(b) determining whether the transaction is valid or not ...;  
(c) approving the VTA ...;  
(d) executing the transaction ...;  
(e) requesting an approval-after-the-card-transaction (AACT) of the authorization center for setting an actual transaction amount (ATA) on the basis of the actual executed transaction;  
(f) revalidating the VTA into the ATA ...; and  
(g) initializing the self-service facility for a next transaction and issuing a receipt for the actual executed transaction.”

Independent Claim 10 includes similar limitations.

Since independent Claim 1 is clearly patentable over the proposed combination of Watson and Pescitelli et al., claims 2-9 which depend from and further limit this allowable base claim are also deemed patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Watson and Pescitelli et al. be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither of these references, alone or in combination, make obvious the invention as presently claimed and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for immediate allowance. Early and favorable action is hereby respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jong In LEE et al.

DATE: November 17, 2003



Michael K. Kinney, Reg. No. 42,740  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct: (203) 498-4411  
Email: mkinney@wiggin.com

WIGGIN & DANA LLP  
One Century Tower  
P.O. Box 1832  
New Haven, Connecticut 06508-1832  
Tel. No.: (203) 498-4400  
Fax No.: (203) 782-2889

\\12543\\1\\435280.1